

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
January 18, 2017**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:01 PM, in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Guarino, Chairman and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine
ABSENT: Salmon, Cone

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - HDRC Commissioner Work Session - February 1, 2017 - 12:00 PM
 - Historic Wood Window Repair Certification Class - February 3 and 4 – Richter House-Hemisfair Park
 - Realtor Training:Historic House Specialist Course - February 14, 2017 - 115 Plaza de Armas
- CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2017-018 | 221 CLAUDIA ST |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-014 | 9800 AIRPORT BLVD |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2016-535 | 226 MADISON ST |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-017 | 601 E CARSON |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2017-016 | 719 S FLORES ST |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-023 | 401 NORTH DR |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-022 | 2031 W SUMMIT |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2017-012 | 413 N PINE ST |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-010 | 2000 BROADWAY |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-006 | 8514 MISSION RD |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-005 | 415 CEDAR ST |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2017-003 | 812 BURLESON ST |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2017-004 | 104 FIR |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2017-013 | 317 KING WILLIAM |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2016-517 | 2231 SE MILITARY DR |
| • Item #16, Case No. 2017-007 | 702 SHERMAN |
| • Item #17, Case No. 2017-002 | 601, 607 & 611 N ST MARYS |
| • Item #18, Case No. 2015-149 | 600 BLOCK OF BURLESON AT OLIVE |
| • Item #19, Case No. 2016-470 | 419 N HACKBERRY ST |

Items# 10 & #18 were pulled for Recusals. Items #15, #16, #18 & #19 were pulled for Citizens to Be Heard.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve the Consent Agenda with staff recommendations based on the findings.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

10. HDRC NO. 2017-006

Applicant: Clay Hagendorf/Beaty Palmer Architects

Address: 8514 MISSION RD

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a new parking lot and landscaped plaza to serve the Stinson Municipal Airport. The new parking lot will replace an existing, informal parking lot in the same location. The proposed improvements will also extend pedestrian walkways along Mission Road.

January 18, 2017

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is proposing to construct a new parking lot and landscaped plaza to serve the Stinson Municipal Airport that will replace an existing, informal parking lot in the same location. The proposed improvements will also extend pedestrian walkways along Mission Road. A previous design was approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission for a new parking lot at this location on April 15, 2015.
- b. CURB CUTS – The applicant has proposed one new curb cut to facilitate automobile access to the new parking locations. This curb cut is to serve the southern parking location. The proposed northern parking location will be connected to an existing parking lot. Staff finds the proposed parking locations and curb cut consistent with the UDC Section 35-672(b)(1).
- c. SIDEWALKS – The applicant has proposed to extend the existing concrete sidewalk across the front of the proposed new parking lot. Staff finds this proposal appropriate.
- d. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has provided a landscaping plan and material exhibit which includes specific plant materials and information regarding the buffering and screening of parking from the public right of way. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-672(b)(3).
- e. ARCHAEOLOGY – The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through d with the following stipulation:

- i. Archaeology – The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

RECUSAL: Laffoon

THE MOTION CARRIED

15. HDRC NO. 2016- 517

Applicant: Bret Mullins

Address: 2231 SE MILITARY DR

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a multi-tenant pylon sign at 2231 SE Military Drive.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to install a multi-tenant pylon sign at the new construction located at 2231 SE Military Drive. The applicant has proposed for the pylon sign to be thirty-five (35) feet in height, feature an overall width of twenty (20) feet and feature six internally illuminated cabinets with an aluminum base. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the UDC Section 35-678(c) in regards to lighting.
- b. In regards to size, the UDC allows signage of up to fifty (50) square feet for each business or service. The proposed signage exceeds fifty (50) square feet; however, staff finds that given the commercial nature of SE Military drive which features a total of six lanes of traffic flowing east and west and the development for which this signage is proposed, the requested height and width are appropriate. Additionally, the proposed signage is consistent with signage found at other locations along SE Military that serve businesses with a similar number of tenants. The re facing of signage in regards to this pylon sign may be approved administratively.
- c. This request was original heard by the HDRC on December 21, 2016, where it was referred to the Design Review

January 18, 2017

Committee. The DRC reviewed this request on January 10, 2017, where the committee noted that the proposed sign at a height of thirty-five (35) feet was appropriate for the setting and that the overall signage proposal was appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a and b.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Brady Alexander spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

THIS ITEM WAS TABLED DUE TO THE APPLICANTS ABSENCE

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to table this item until the applicant is present at the meeting.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

The applicant joined the meeting at 4:30 PM

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Garza and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to move for approval with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2016-517

Applicant: Jenny De La Rosa/HHGC, LLC

Address: 702 SHERMAN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a new single family house on the vacant lot at 702 Sherman to feature approximately 1,700 square feet.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to construct a single family house on the vacant lot at 702 Sherman, in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The applicant has noted that the proposed new construction will feature an overall square footage of approximately 1,700 square feet.

b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

c. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has noted that a setback of twenty-four (24) feet has been proposed. Sherman currently features structures that feature setbacks ranging from approximately twenty feet to approximately thirty feet. Staff recommends the applicant provide a site plan with context of the adjacent structures to note both the setbacks on Sherman as well as the setbacks along Willow.

d. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward Sherman. This is consistent with the Guidelines and the historic example found in this part of Dignowity Hill.

e. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i. a height and massing similar to historic

January 18, 2017

structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a single story structure on a vacant lot adjacent to lots that contain historic structures of comparable heights. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

f. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. The applicant has proposed a foundation height that appears to be approximately 12 to 18 inches in height. When returning for final approval, the applicant should provide information regarding the foundation heights of adjacent structures to demonstrate that the proposed foundation height will be consistent with the Guidelines.

g. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a roof form that includes a front gabled roof over the front porch and two hipped roofs that culminate at the rear of the proposed new construction. Both roof forms are found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District and are consistent with the Guidelines.

h. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – The applicant has proposed window and door openings that include a two double windows on the front façade, a bay window on the west façade, a single width and a double width window on the east façade and a small window opening. On the west, east and south facades, the applicant has proposed small window openings just below the plate height of each wall. Staff recommends the applicant separate the proposed double width windows on each façade and proposed additional fenestration on the west, east and south facades, particularly at near the front of the proposed new construction.

i. **LOT COVERAGE** – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The applicant's proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.

j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials to include an asphalt shingle roof, wood or aluminum windows and fiber cement siding. The materials are generally consistent with the Guidelines. To ensure that the proposed materials are similar in finish and character in keeping with the historic fabric of the district, staff recommends wood for windows and doors and that the smooth side of cement board siding is exposed. The applicant should provide additional information regarding proposed materials and installation details when returning for final approval.

k. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, the applicant has proposed architectural forms that are consistent with the Guidelines, including a front porch with appropriate depth and a side window bay. Staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed front and rear porch columns.

l. **FRONT DOOR** – The applicant has proposed a front door that features detailing that is not comparable to historic examples found throughout the district. Staff recommends that the applicant install a front door that features design elements comparable to the many traditional doors found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

m. **DRIVEWAY** – At the rear (south) of the lot, the applicant has proposed a driveway to provide entrance to the lot from Willow Street. The applicant has noted that the driveway will feature a width of twelve (12) feet. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.ii. notes that driveways should not exceed ten (10) feet in width. The applicant should reduce the width of the proposed driveway to become consistent with the Guidelines.

n. **LANDSCAPING** – At this time, the applicant has not provided a detailed landscaping plan. Staff recommends the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan prior to returning to the HDRC.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through m with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide staff with an updated site plan noting the setback of the proposed new construction as well as the setbacks of the existing, adjacent historic structures.
- ii. That the applicant separate the proposed double width windows, install additional window fenestration and eliminate the proposed short windows from each façade.
- iii. That the applicant screen all mechanical equipment.
- iv. That the applicant provide information regarding proposed materials and installation details as noted in finding j.
- v. That the applicant provide information regarding the foundation heights of adjacent structures as noted in finding f.
- vi. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed foundation height including an exact height and information regarding consistency with neighboring historic structures.
- vii. That the applicant install a new front door as noted in finding l.
- viii. That the applicant reduce the proposed driveway to a width of no more than ten (10) feet.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

January 18, 2017

Justin Flores spoke in support but with some concerns regarding the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve with staff stipulations

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2015-149

Applicant: John Cooley

Address: 600 Block of Burleson at Olive

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to amend the previously approved designs of prototype 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B.

FINDINGS:

- a. The construction of twenty-three detached structures on the 600 Block of Burleson received final approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission on July 15, 2015. Since that time, the applicant has received an HDRC Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of an additional prototype model as well as revisions to that prototype, most recently on April 20, 2016.
- b. The existing windows were initially installed incorrectly. Since that time, the applicant has worked with OHP staff to find a solution to mitigate the inappropriate windows. The application used to mitigate the inappropriate windows should be used on all prototypes.
- c. The applicant has proposed modifications to prototype 1A which include the removal of the middle column at porch entry, the redesign of the front porch columns, a modified front porch roof, a revised window bay, revised roof brackets, revised windows on the second floor facades, revised windows at the porch entry, the addition of trim below the roof line, a revised front door entry, the addition of windows to the rear façade, the replacing of a sliding door with a single door at the rear, the addition of steps to the rear door, the revision of window height and trim on the second floor rear elevation.
- d. The applicant has proposed modifications to prototype 1B which include the addition of a hipped roof on the first floor, the removal of the middle porch column, revisions to column design, revisions to the front window bay, the removal of brackets from below the roof line, second floor window revisions, porch window revisions, the addition of trim below the roof lines, porch door revisions, the addition of rear façade windows, the replacing of a sliding door with a single door, the addition of porch steps to the rear door and the revision of the side elevation's shed porch roof.
- e. The applicant has proposed modification to prototype 2A that include a mirrored front elevation, the redesign of front porch columns, revisions to the porch roof, revision of first floor window openings and trim, revision to the second floor windows, revision to the porch windows, the addition of trim below the roof line, front door revisions, the addition of a window on the rear façade, the replacing of a sliding door with a single door, the addition of steps to the rear door, the revision of second floor rear windows and revisions to the side elevation that include the installation of a hot water heater closet door.
- f. The applicant has proposed modifications to prototype 2B that include the addition of a hipped roof to the second floor, a mirrored elevation, the redesign of the front porch columns, the modification of the front porch roof, the revision of first floor windows and trim, the revision of second floor windows and trim, the revision of the front porch door, the addition of trim below the roof lines, the addition of a hipped roof to the second floor, the addition of a rear window, the replacing of a sliding door with a single door, the addition of porch steps to the rear door and the installation of a hot water heater closet door.
- g. The applicant has proposed modifications to prototype 2B's garage which include the installation of a side door.
- h. HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed an increase in the plate height of each structure from 18' – 0" to 19' – 3". Staff finds the proposed additional height inappropriate and recommends the applicant maintain the originally approved plate heights.
- i. COLUMNS – The applicant has proposed to reduce the number of columns on each unit from three to two. Staff finds that two columns are appropriate and provide balance to the proposed front porches.
- j. WINDOWS – The applicant has proposed to modify the location and number of previously approved windows. The applicant has proposed to modify the windows in a way that generally relates to the existing window openings and proportions of the units; however, staff finds that where the applicant has proposed a single window, additional fenestration should be added. Staff recommends the applicant adhere to the previously agreed upon window treatments and install windows that feature dark colored frames.

January 18, 2017

k. Generally, the applicant's proposed modifications are in keeping with the designs originally approved by the HDRC. Staff finds that the proposed modifications are in keeping with the design merit of the original design and will not negatively impact the proposed new construction's overall design; however, staff finds that the proposed increase in plate height inappropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant maintain the existing height.
- ii. That the applicant add additional fenestration wherever a single window is proposed.
- iii. That the applicant adhere to previously agreed upon window treatments and install windows that feature dark colored frames.
- iv. That the applicant install windows that feature dark colored frames.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Justin Flores spoke in opposition to the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION: The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to move approval with the adoption of one staff stipulation, that applicant must maintain existing plate height. Staff stipulations ii, iii, and iv will not be adopted.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon , Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

RECUSAL: Garza

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2016-470

Applicant: Cibrian Properties LLC

Address: 419 N HACKBERRY ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a single family house to feature approximately 1,470 square feet on the vacant lot at 419 N Hackberry.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a single family house to feature approximately 1,470 square feet on the vacant lot at 419 N Hackberry.
- b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee on December 14, 2016. At that meeting commissioners commented on the proposed foundation heights, setbacks, materials and fenestration patterns.
- c. This request received conceptual approval at the January 6, 2017, HDRC hearing with staff's stipulations which included that the applicant revise the proposed front porch design to include appropriately scaled and placed columns, that the applicant include additional window fenestration, that the applicant screen all mechanical equipment and that the applicant provide staff with additional information regarding windows materials and window fenestration.
- d. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback of 8' – 6" from the property line parallel with Glorietta and approximately 10' – 0" from the property line parallel with N Hackberry. Average setbacks from the public right of way along Gloritta are greater than twenty (20) feet. Staff recommends the applicant provide a site plan noting the proposed new construction's setbacks as well as the setbacks of adjacent structures.
- e. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward N Hackberry. Along N Hackberry, historic structures on corner lots are oriented toward both N Hackberry and the secondary street. Staff finds the proposed entrance orientation appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a single story structure with an overall height of

January 18, 2017

approximately twenty (20) feet in height. The historic structure in the immediate vicinity feature comparable heights. The applicant's proposed height is consistent with the Guidelines.

g. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. The applicant has proposed a minimal foundation height of approximately 1' – 3". Historic structures throughout Dignowity Hill commonly feature foundation heights of up to eighteen inches in height. Staff finds the applicant's proposed foundation heights appropriate; however, staff finds that the applicant should provide a study of the historic pattern on this block to ensure that the foundation height is consistent with those in the immediate vicinity.

h. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a roof form that includes both elements of a front gabled roof and a side gabled roof. Both roof forms are found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District and are consistent with the Guidelines.

i. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – The applicant has proposed window and door openings that are generally appropriately sized. Staff recommends the applicant consider installing additional window openings. A stipulation of conceptual approval was for the installation of windows that shared a proportion closer to those of historic windows in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. At this time, the applicant has submitted revised elevations that include the installation of revised window proportions.

j. **LOT COVERAGE** – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant's proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.

k. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials to include an asphalt shingle roof and Hardi board siding. The applicant has not specified window or door materials. Staff recommends the applicant install wood windows that are inset at least two (2) inches within each wall. Staff recommends the applicant refer to the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document for additional guidance on window installation. The installation of wood windows is in keeping with the historic fabric of the district.

l. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, the applicant has proposed architectural forms that are consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant has provided a revised front porch design that includes four evenly spaced front porch columns, windows on each side of the front door and a centered front door. Staff finds the proposed front porch design appropriate.

m. **COLUMNS** – At this time, the applicant has not provided staff with a specific column design. The applicant is to provide a column detail to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

n. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has not noted the location and screening of mechanical equipment. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment from view of the public right of way.

o. **DRIVEWAY** – There is currently a curb cut, apron and concrete driveway approach on Glorietta. The applicant has proposed to maintain this existing configuration.

p. **SIDEWALK** – The applicant has proposed a front yard sidewalk to lead from the front porch to the public right of way along N Hackberry. Historically, front yard sidewalks were centered on the structure's façade or on the structure's front porch. The applicant has proposed neither. Staff recommends the applicant revise the proposed

q. **LANDSCAPING** – At this time, the applicant has not provided a detailed landscaping plan. Staff recommends the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan prior to returning to the HDRC

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through q with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide a final column detail to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the applicant screen all mechanical equipment.
- iii. That the applicant install wood windows throughout the proposed new construction that are inset at least two (2) inches within walls.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Justin Flores spoke in support but with concerns regarding the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

January 18, 2017

Applicant: Carlos Rodriguez/Brightstar Development, LLC

Address: 608 DAWSON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting an amendment to a previous Certificate of Appropriateness issued by the Historic and Design Review Commission. The amendments include the following:

1. Install 14 on each building (28 total) aluminum clad one over one windows in lieu of 28 total previously approved wood 4 over 4 windows
2. Install 6 on each building (12 total) aluminum clad fixed square windows in lieu of 16 total previously approved wood fixed square windows
3. Install 2 on each building (4 total) aluminum clad fixed elongated windows in lieu of 4 total previously approved wood fixed elongated windows with one dividing light
4. Install 1 on each building (2 total) aluminum clad fixed windows in lieu of previously approved wood fixed windows with 2 x 3 dividing lights
5. Install hardiboard siding and trim in lieu of wood siding and trim
6. Alter fenestration and remove previously approved windows including one front window with 2 x 6 dividing lights on each building (2 total) and one side square fixed window on the side elevation of each building (2 total)
7. Install a front door with small window light in lieu of 2 total previously approved wood French door with 2 x 3 dividing lights
8. Install a rear door with small window light in lieu of 2 total previously approved wood paneled rear doors

FINDINGS:

a. The project received final approval from the HDRC on May 4, 2016, to construct two 2-story units on a vacant lot and install fencing.

b. The project received approval to install wood windows in various configurations and install wood siding and wood trim in the two units. During construction, aluminum clad one over one windows and hardiboard siding and trim were installed. The applicant received a stop work order as work was done outside the scope of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

c. ITEM #1, 2, 3 - On May 4, 2016, staff cited the Guidelines for New Construction, which states windows used in new construction must maintain traditional dimensions and profiles and should be recessed within the window frame. A detail of the wood 4 over 4 windows and fixed windows and wall section was submitted to staff and staff found the details within the proposed elevation consistent with the Guidelines.

d. ITEM #1, 2, 3 - The proposed windows are putty gray aluminum clad one over one, fixed square or fixed horizontal elongated windows. According to the Guidelines for Windows, windows in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profiles and be recessed within the window frame. Wood windows are most appropriate. Double-hung, block frame windows that feature alternative materials may be considered on a case-by-case basis. They should feature traditional trim and sill details. Paired windows should be separated by a wood mullion. Staff finds the proposed windows are consistent with the Guidelines in terms of profile as they are inset 1 5/6", however staff finds that the paired or trim and the color and texture is not similar to traditional materials. Staff finds that though alternative materials may be appropriate, staff finds that wood is most appropriate and what was approved on May 4, 2016 by the HDRC.

e. ITEM #4 - On May 4, 2016, staff recommended approval and the HDRC approved 2 wood fixed windows with 2x 3 dividing lights on the front of each building. The proposed new windows are aluminum clad fixed with no dividing lights. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, windows used in new construction must maintain traditional dimensions and profiles and should be recessed within the window frame. Staff finds the long fixed windows without dividing lights not traditional and therefore not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the windows include dividing lights.

f. SIDING/TRIM - On May 4, 2016, staff commented that both wood and hardiboard would be appropriate materials according to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i. Wood siding was indicated on the plans submitted by the applicant and approved by the HDRC. The proposed siding is hardiboard siding and hardiboard trim. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i., use materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditional found in the district. Staff finds the proposed hardiboard appropriate for new construction and consistent with the Guidelines as it complements wood in color and texture, , but recommends that the smooth side be exposed instead of the faux grain finish.

g. FENESTRATION ALTERATIONS - Previously there were two double hung windows on the left and two fixed square windows on the right side. The proposed fenestration has the windows switched on each building. The proposed windows to be removed include the front fixed window with 2 x 3 dividing lights of each building and one fixed square window from each building. According to Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings should be of a similar proportion of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades.

January 18, 2017

Staff finds the façades without the windows and with the fenestration alterations are similar to other historic structures in the district, and therefore consistent with the Guidelines.

h. FRONT DOORS – On May 4, 2016, the HDRC approved two front doors with 2 x 3 dividing lights. The new proposed doors are doors with one small window light. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, door openings of new construction should feature a similar proportion and fenestration patterns to those of historic structures found throughout the district. Staff finds the proposed door with a single light appropriate for the character of the district, and consistent with the Guidelines.

i. REAR DOORS - On May 4, 2016, the HDRC approved two solid rear doors with 3 panels. The new proposed doors are doors with one small window light. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, door openings of new construction should feature a similar proportion and fenestration patterns to those of historic structures found throughout the district. Staff finds the proposed door with a single light appropriate for the character of the district, and consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through 7 based on findings a through i with the following stipulations:

1. That the paired windows be separated by a wood trim as noted in finding d.
2. That the all new windows be made of wood as noted in finding d.
3. That the 2 aluminum clad fixed windows include dividing lights as noted in finding e.
4. That the hardiboard siding to be used be installed with the smooth side exposed.

CASE COMMENTS:

HDRC: Final 5/4/16, Conceptual 3/16/16

The applicant received a stop work order as work was done outside the scope, and the applicant has provided the required application and the post-work application fee has been paid.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Justin Flores, spoke in opposition of the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval of items 1-8 with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2017-008

Applicant: Manny Chapa

Address: 714 DAWSON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Repair the existing, wood siding and porch roof.
2. Install new, vinyl windows throughout the primary historic structure to replace the existing, wood windows.
3. Install new 4" x 4" wood front porch columns.
4. Construct a rear addition of approximately 585 square feet.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 714 Dawson was constructed circa 1910 and features traditional architectural elements including both front and side gabled roofs.

b. A stop work order was issued on January 4, 2017, for the removal of original wood windows and the installation of vinyl windows, the framing of a rear addition and other exterior work. No Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness had been issued at that time.

c. REPAIR & WOOD WINDOW REPLACEMENT – Per the applicant's construction documents, the existing wood siding is to be repaired, original wood windows are to be repaired and the existing, original shed porch roof is to remain and be repaired. As noted in finding b, the applicant has removed the existing wood windows and has begun to install vinyl windows. Staff finds the repair of the original wood windows, shed porch roof and wood

January 18, 2017

siding elements appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.

d. **PORCH COLUMNS** – The historic structure currently features two wood posts that serve as front porch columns. The applicant has proposed to remove these posts and install new 4x4 wood posts. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iii., front porch elements such as columns should be replaced in kind with materials that are compatible in scale, massing and detail. Staff finds that the installation of new columns is appropriate; however, staff finds that 6x6 columns that include base and capital moldings should be installed.

e. **ADDITION** – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition of approximately 480 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed for the addition to include a rear facing gabled roof and has proposed similar materials. At this time, the applicant has not proposed an inset in wall planes for the addition nor a transition between the old and the new. Staff recommends the applicant propose an inset in wall planes from the primary historic structure to the addition to serve as a transition.

f. **SCALE, MASS & FORM** – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature an overall roof height that exceeds that of the historic structure. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.B., additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the primary historic structure and should feature a height that is less than that of the historic structure. The applicant's proposed height is neither appropriate nor consistent with the Guidelines.

g. **ADDITION** – As noted in findings g and h, the applicant has not proposed a detail to differentiate the existing addition from the historic structure. Staff finds that through the lowering of the addition's overall height and through the incorporation of siding details, the addition can be visually distinguishable from the primary historic structure.

h. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials for the addition that include wood siding, wood trim and new windows that are to match the existing. Staff finds the installation of wood siding and trim appropriate; however, staff finds that windows that match in material and profile to the original windows should be installed throughout the addition.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of item #1 based on finding d.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #2 based on finding c. Staff recommends that the applicant repair and reinstall all existing, wood windows.

Staff recommends approval of items #3 and #4 with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install 6x6 inch wood columns that feature capital and base moldings.
- ii. That the applicant install a transition detail to distinguish the primary historic structure from the proposed addition.
- iii. That the applicant lower the height of the proposed addition's ridge line to be subordinate to that of the primary historic structure.
- iv. That the applicant install windows in the addition that match in profile and materials to the windows of the primary historic structure.

CASE COMMENT:

The framing of the rear addition, window replacement and exterior modifications all began without a Certificate of Appropriateness. A stop work order was issued on January 4, 2017, after the applicant submitted the HDRC application for the construction of a rear addition and exterior modifications.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Justin Flores spoke in support but with someone concern of the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2016-488

Applicant: Ricardo McCullough

January 18, 2017

Address: 215 CLAUDIA ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a single story addition to the rear of the primary historic structure.
2. Construct a two story apartment at the rear of the lot.

FINDINGS:

a. The historic structure at 215 Claudia was constructed circa 1910 and appears on the 1912 Sanborn maps. The structure is of the Folk Victorian style, featuring a front porch which spans the entire front façade of the structure, two brick chimneys, front and side roof gables and a rear addition. Per the 1912 Sanborn map, this historic structure originally featured a wraparound porch that has since been partially closed to provide additional interior space on the north side of the front façade. The applicant has proposed to demolish the existing rear addition, construct a rear addition and a rear garage and dwelling unit at the rear of the proposed new addition.

b. The demolition of the existing, non-contributing accessory structure, the removal of all burglar bars and front ramp handrails and the installation of front porch columns were all approved at the January 6, 2017, HDRC hearing. Also at that hearing, commissioners noted that an appropriate design for the proposed additions would be to separate the proposed two story garage structure from the proposed

c. ADDITION – At the immediate rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition. The Guidelines for additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed to construct the addition in a manner that would feature a hipped roof subordinate to that of the primary historic structure. The Guidelines in regards to scale and massing note that an addition's roof should be subordinate to that of the primary historic structure. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.

d. TWO STORY GARAGE – At the rear of the lot, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear two story garage structure that is to feature a ground level garage to provide parking for three vehicles and a second level that is to house a dwelling unit. This block of Claudia features approximately twelve primary historic structures, of which only one features two stories; however, there are two story garages at the rear of multiple lots along Claudia. Staff finds the proposed structure's massing appropriate.

e. TWO STORY GARAGE – The applicant has proposed for the garage to feature a hipped roof similar to that of the primary historic structure, window openings similar to those found on the primary historic structure and individual overhead rolling garage doors. Staff finds this appropriate.

f. ADDITION FENESTRATION – The applicant has provided elevations of the proposed addition that generally features window openings that are comparable to those of the primary historic structure. The Guidelines for Additions 4.A.i. states that the shapes of window opening should relate to those of the primary historic structure. Staff finds that the applicant should propose additional fenestration on the rear façade of the proposed rear addition.

g. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include a standing seam metal roof to match the existing, wood trim, siding and vinyl windows. At this time, the applicant has not specified a siding material or profile. Staff recommends the applicant install siding that features like materials and profiles as that of the primary historic structure. Additionally, staff recommends the applicant install wood windows in the proposed addition to be consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.

APPLICANT WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THIS MEETING

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to move this item to the next agenda, due to the applicant being absent.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

January 18, 2017

Applicant: Steve Newman

Address: 311 BARRERA

This item was postponed by the applicant.

24. HDRC NO. 2017-009

Applicant: Nick Harris/FSG San Antonio

Address: 220 BROADWAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install new signage on the historic structure at 220 Broadway, commonly known as the Travelers Hotel. Within this request, the applicant has proposed the following:

1. One (1) east facing wall sign reading "Premier Best Western" with a "BWP" logo to feature an overall height of 4' – 11" and an overall length of 37' – 2 ½".
2. One (1) north facing wall sign reading "Premier Best Western" with a "BWP" logo to feature an overall height of 4' – 11" and an overall length of 37' – 2 ½".
3. One (1) double faced blade sign featuring a total height of 28' – 0" and a width of 4' – 0".

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 220 Broadway is commonly known as the Travelers Hotel and was constructed in 1914. The structure has undergone rehabilitative efforts which were approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission on June 3, 2015. At that time, staff's recommendation included findings noting that the existing, painted façade signage would be repainted. As of January 10, 2017, the existing wall signage has been painted over.

b. WALL SIGNS – The applicant has proposed to install two (2) wall signs on the west and north facades. Both wall signs are to read "Premier Best Western" with a "BWP" logo to feature an overall height of 4' – 11" and an overall length of 37' – 2 ½". The Guidelines for Signage 1.A. states that historic structures are to be allowed one major and two minor signs, totaling no more than fifty (50) square feet. Additionally, new signs should be based on evidence of historic signs that the historic structure once featured. Staff finds the installation of the proposed wall signs inappropriate and inconsistent with the Historic Design Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant repaint the existing wall signs that were originally located on both the west and north facades.

c. BLADE SIGN – The applicant has proposed to install a blade sign on the Broadway elevation to feature a total height of 28' – 0" and a width of 4' – 0". The applicant has noted that the proposed blade sign is to be comparable in size to the existing blade sign on the structure. The adjacent historic structure at 214 Broadway also features a blade sign. Staff recommends the applicant install a blade sign comparable to the existing two in regards to lighting, materials and square footage and locate this blade sign to the north of the existing hotel blade sign. Staff recommends that the applicant maintain and repair the existing blade sign on the structure's west facade.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 through #3. Staff recommends that the applicant repaint the existing painted wall signage and install a blade sign comparable to the existing two on this block face in regards to lighting, materials and square footage. Additionally, staff recommends that the applicant maintain and repair the existing blade sign.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval as presented.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2017-011

Applicant: Sergio Villegas/FastSigns

Address: 110 MCCULLOUGH AVE / 615 ELM

January 18, 2017

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage at 110 McCullough/615 Elm. The applicant has proposed to install the following signs:

1. A freestanding sign featuring two banners that is to feature a height of fourteen (14) feet. Each banner is to feature an overall size of thirty-six (36) inches in height and twenty-four (24) inches in width. Each banner arm will be twenty-seven (27) inches in length. This sign will be non-illuminated.
2. One panel frame sign to feature an overall height of nine (9) feet. The banner is to feature an overall width of fifty-four (54) inches with an overall height of thirty-six (36) inches.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to install signage at 110 McCullough/615 Elm, the location of the individually designated landmark, the Dulling House. The applicant has received administrative approval to reface a number of existing signs on the property.
- b. FREESTANDING SIGN – The applicant has proposed to install one two banners that is to feature a height of fourteen (14) feet. Each banner is to feature an overall size of thirty-six (36) inches in height and twenty-four (24) inches in width. Each banner arm will be twenty-seven (27) inches in length. This sign will be non-illuminated. This sign is to be located near the intersection of Elm, Bonham and McCullough. Per the Guidelines for Signage, each building is to be allowed one major and two minor signs; total requested square footage should not exceed fifty (50) square feet. The applicant has proposed an overall square footage of twenty-four square feet when including both sides of the proposed banner. Staff finds the proposed sizes appropriate; however, the Guidelines for Signage 4.B.i. notes that the overall height of freestanding signage should not exceed six (6) feet in height.
- c. BANNERS – At all times, the applicant should maintain banners to comply with the City of San Antonio, Code of Ordinances, Chapter 28-110 regarding sign maintenance. All sign components are to remain in good repair with the proper structural supports. Any tearing, fading or other damage should be repaired immediately. With the HDRC approval of banner locations modifications to or changing of banners may be eligible for administrative approval.
- d. PANEL SIGN – In the front yard of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to install one panel frame sign to feature an overall height of nine (9) feet. The banner is to feature an overall width of fifty-four (54) inches with an overall height of thirty-six (36) inches for a total square footage of twenty-seven (27) square feet. Staff finds the proposed square footage appropriate; however, the applicant should reduce the height of the proposed sign to no more than six (6) feet in height.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the applicant reduce the height of both signs to not exceed six (6) feet and that the proposed banners to maintained in accordance with the City of San Antonio, Code of Ordinances, Chapter 28-110.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Brittain to move for approval as submitted.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2016-536

Applicant: Juan Berrera

Address: 510 ADAMS ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification and Verification for the property at 510 Adams.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 510 Adams was constructed circa 1930 and features Craftsman style elements. On July 15, 2015,

January 18, 2017

the applicant received approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission to rehabilitate the historic structure and construct a rear addition. On October 21, 2016, the applicant received approval from the HDRC to demolish the non-original concrete porch and to construct a wood porch.

b. The scope of work includes various exterior items, including the installation of a standing seam metal roof and the construction of a wood front porch. Staff finds that the installation of the standing seam metal roof is not consistent with the historic examples found throughout the neighborhood nor is it consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Additionally, staff finds that the applicant's reconstructed wood porch features porch railings that are architecturally inappropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff finds that the applicant has substantially invested in the historic structure and recommends approval of Historic Tax Verification. Staff recommends the applicant address the architecturally inappropriate porch railings as well as the inappropriate ridge caps.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to move this item to the next agenda due to the applicants absence.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

APPLICANT JOINED THE MEETING AT 5:37

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to move for approval with the stipulation that the front porch detail be altered from its current condition to a more historically appropriate one.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

27. HDRC NO. 2017-021

Applicant: Myfe Moore

Address: 603 RIVER RD

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install 38 solar panels at this address, including:

1. 8 panels on the flat roof to left of the front gable
2. 16 panels on the left front gable
3. 14 panels on the front slope of the accessory structure.

FINDINGS:

a. The home is a new construction home located in the River Road Historic District, which was designated in 2010.

b. The main structure has three front gables and a flat roof and standing seam metal. The side accessory structure along River Road is two-story with a side gable roof. Of the 38 proposed solar panels 16 panels will be installed on the left slope of the front gable; 8 panels will be installed on the flat roof to the left of the front gable, and 14 will be installed on the front slope of the side accessory structure. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C., installations should be in locations that minimize visibility from the public right-of-way.

c. Staff visited the site on January 11, 2017. The home is located on the corner of River Road and Armour Place., on the east edge of the district. Staff found that there are many trees on the lot that reduce the visibility of the solar panels, but that the front facing panels would still be seen from the public right-of-way and negatively impact the neighboring historic structures. Staff finds the proposed panels on the flat roof consistent with the Guidelines, but finds the panels mounted on the front gable and the front slope of the accessory structure not consistent with the Guidelines for locations of solar panels. Staff recommends that alternate locations be explored.

January 18, 2017

d. The proposed panels will be mounted flush with the pitched and flat roofs. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.ii, solar collectors should be flush with the roof surface. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of item #1 based on finding a through d. Staff does not recommend approval of items #2 and 3 based on findings a through d and recommends the applicant explore alternate locations for the solar panels.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia

NAYS: Lazarine

THE MOTION CARRIED

28. HDRC NO. 2017-019

Applicant: Chet Graham

Address: 220 HERMINE BLVD

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 198 square foot rear addition and construct a and accessory structure, that is 448 square feet, with an attached carport of 560 square feet.

FINDINGS:

a. The main structure is a minimal traditional house of modest size featuring a stone façade, composition shingle roof, cross-gabled roof and a shed roof over the front porch. It is a contributing structure in the Olmos Park Terrace, and was designated in 2007.

Findings related to the request to construct a rear addition

b. SCALE, MASSING, AND FORM – There is an existing rear covered porch with a shed roof, that is approximately 166 square feet. The proposed addition had a shed roof at the same height as the existing porch shed roof. The rear addition is approximately 200 square feet. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1., the addition should utilize a similar roof form, be subordinate to the principal façade, and be consistent with the height of the existing structure. Staff finds the proposed addition is consistent with the Guidelines as it is in the rear and in replace of an existing covered porch.

c. MATERIALS – The main structure includes stone, wood lap siding, and composition shingles. The proposed addition will include wood lap siding and composition shingles. According to the Guidelines for Addition 3.A.i., materials should match type, color, and offset to distinguish the addition from the main structure. The proposed addition is adjacent to a stone wall and offset 6” from the plane of the main structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

d. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The main structure has wood one over one windows and a rear wood door with half window light. The proposed addition will obscure 1 one over one window and the rear door. The addition will use a salvaged solid wood door with square panels and install 3 horizontal rectangle windows. According to the Guidelines for Additions 4.Aii, incorporate details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure. Details should be simple and compliment the character of the main structure. Staff finds the windows, doors and fenestration consistent with the main structure and the Guidelines.

Findings related to the request to construct a rear accessory structure

e. SETBACKS/ORIENTATION – There is an existing 6’ cedar plank fence and behind it there is open lawn and one tree. The new construction will be set along the existing fence line and is 5’ from the left property line. 36’ of the existing fence will be removed to expose the front façade of the new construction. Staff finds the proposed setbacks and orientation are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B, as the carport is set behind the main structure.

f. CHARACTER – The main structure is a minimal traditional house of modest size featuring a stone façade, composition shingle roof and a cross-gabled roof. The proposed rear accessory structure has a front gable roof, wood lap siding, stone siding, a standing seam metal roof and is one-story and 448 square feet of enclosed space. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii., new outbuildings should relate to the period of construction of the

January 18, 2017

principal building. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines in terms of siding, scale, and roof form, but finds that the roof material not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the roof be a material similar to that on the main structure.

g. MASSING/FORM – The proposed accessory structure is a one-story building with a carport. The proposed structure is approximately 12' tall and the footprint of the structure and carport is approximately 1,000 square feet. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A., new outbuildings should be no larger in plan than 40% of the principal historic structure's foot print, and should be visibly subordinate to historic structures. Staff made a site visit January 11, 2017, and found that the proposed garage would be minimally seen from the public right-of-way as it is set to the rear of the main structure. Staff finds the proposed form consistent with the Guidelines.

h. WINDOWS/DOORS – The proposed accessory structure is a one-story building with a carport, 3 pedestrian doors and 5 fixed windows. The proposed windows are wood fixed windows with 2 x 2 dividing lights and two wood one over one. The double doors are solid wood with one single light in each and the single door is a salvaged door from the rear of the main structure. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v., doors and windows should be similar in proportion and materials as those traditional found in the district. Staff finds the proposed door and window proportions consistent with those found on the main structure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through h with the following stipulations:

1. That the windows on the addition be made of wood, inset 1 to 2 inches, and a section detail be submitted to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
2. That the roof of the accessory structure be made of composition shingles to be similar to the roof material on the main structure.
3. That a detail of the double doors on the shed be submitted to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
4. That the windows on the accessory structure be made of wood, inset 1 to 2 inches, and a section detail be submitted to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to move for approval with stipulation that the metal roof be permitted on the accessory structure.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to Adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor & seconded by Commissioner Garcia to adjourn.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Brittain, Laffoon, Garza, Grube, Garcia, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:49 PM.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair